06-25-08

PTO/SB/21 (01-08) Approved for use through 06/30/2008. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number 10/595,735 TRANSMITTAL Filing Date 05/08/2006 First Named Inventor **FORM** Bruce G. Kania Art Unit 3643 Examiner Name Andrea M. Valenti (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number FOU06-0002 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC Petition (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Change of Correspondence Address Affidavits/declaration(s) Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify Terminal Disclaimer Extension of Time Request below): Provisional Election (2 pages) Request for Refund **Express Abandonment Request** CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name Antoiffette M. Tease, P.L.L.C. Signature Printed name binette M. Tease Date Reg. No. 06/24/2008 53680 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first elass mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Express Signature Date Antoinette M. Tease 06/24/2008 Typed or printed name

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:

10/595,735

Filing Date:

05/08/2006

Applicant:

Bruce G. Kania

Title:

Renewably Buoyant, Self-Protective Floating Habitat

Examiner/GAU:

Andrea M. Valenti/3643

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

The Honorable Commissioner for Patents Washington, District of Columbia 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated June 5, 2008, the applicant provisionally elects, with traverse, Group INa, claims 94-97 and 99, for further reexamination on the merits in the present application.

The applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement because the PTO has not carried forward its burden of proof to establish distinctness for each and every claim group. In particular, MPEP

§ 802 states:

If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application, the Director may require the application to be restricted to one of the inventions.

Furthermore, MPEP § 803 provides:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

In this case, the examiner has made distinctions between claim groups that are clearly not independent and distinct inventions, nor would the examiner face a serious burden if certain claim groups were searched together.

For example, the examiner has treated claims 44-45, 50-53 and 93 as a single claim group (Species 1G) and claims 46-53 and 93 as another claim group (Species 1H). Claims 44, 46 and 49 are identical except that in claim 44 the bottom, sides and top of the habitat are resistant to penetration by plant roots, in claim 46 only the bottom and sides are resistant to penetration by plant roots, and in claim 49 only the sides are resistant to penetration by plant roots. There is no logical basis for treating claim 44 any differently than claims 46 and 49; nonetheless, the examiner has segregated these claims into separate claim groups.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding election requirement. Although the applicant acknowledges that a restriction requirement is appropriate in this case, the applicant also feels that the examiner may have gone overboard in establishing the separate claim groups.

Respectfully submitted,

Antoinette M. Tease

ANTOINETTE M. TEASE, P.L.L.C.

Attorney for Applicant

PO Box 51016

Billings, MT 59105

(406) 245-5254

Registration No. 53860

Certificate of Mailing: I certify that on the date below this document and referenced attachments, if any, were filed electronically with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Vitoinette M. Tease

Vune 24, 2008